UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Rodney Stokes,) C/A No. 5:20-cv-02431-DCN-KDW
)
Plaintiff,	
V.	ORDER
Ronnie Williams; David Robinson; Michael Stephen; Byron King; Erica))
Wright; and Taylor White,	
Defendants.)) _)

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On April 15, 2021, Defendant White filed a Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 97, and on April 16, 2021, Defendants King, Robinson, Stephen, Williams, and Wright filed a separate Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 98. Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of such motions and of the need for him to file adequate responses. ECF No. 99. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, the Defendants' motions may be granted, thereby ending this case against him. *See id.* However, notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff has failed to respond to Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendants' Motion by **August 23, 2021**. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for

failure to prosecute. See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

July 26, 2021 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Haymai D. Hest